

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the patent application.

**I. THE OBJECTION**

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the claims are objected to for technical reasons.

The claims are amended in view of the points raised therein.

For this reason, it is respectfully requested that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**II. THE INDEFINITENESS REJECTION**

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-29 are rejected as being indefinite, although we believe the Examiner really meant to object only method claims 1-21.

Nevertheless, independent claims 1, 22 and 26 are amended in view of the points raised by the Examiner, including reciting active verbs to describe the steps of providing the link.

For this reason, it is respectfully requested that the indefiniteness rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**III. THE ANTICIPATION REJECTION**

In paragraphs 4-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 10, 12, 15, 16 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Müller (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,375).

However, it is respectfully submitted that Müller does not teach or suggest a method for operating user equipment in a telecommunication network for receiving packets during a packet service mode featuring the step of entering user equipment (UE) into a discontinuous reception mode when receiving packets while maintaining the logical connection in higher protocol layers during a packet service mode, as claimed herein.

As set forth in the patent application, page 2, lines 2-4, the prior art, including Müller, does not provide a mechanism to provide power saving by discontinuous reception during a packet session. In the prior art, during long packet service sessions, the telecommunications network does not release the connection despite the fact that no data is being transferred.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Müller discloses a way to place the UE in a sleep mode, but not when receiving packets during a packet service mode, as claimed herein.

In paragraphs 6-9 of the Office Action, the remaining dependent claims are rejected in relation to the proposed combinations of Müller and other cited references, which also do not disclose the aforementioned feature in order to make up for the deficiency in the teaching of Müller.

For this reason, it is respectfully requested that the rejections to the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**IV. THE ALLOWABLE CLAIMS REJECTION**

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, dependent claims 7-9 and 17-20 are indicated to be allowable if rewritten or amended in view of the aforementioned objection and rejections.

In view of the points above, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance.

**V. CONCLUSION**

Reconsideration and early allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Barber  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 32,720

/dap  
February 6, 2004  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Customer No. 004955  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
(203) 261-1234